1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
2	HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS, JUDGE PRESIDING		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
5	PLAINTIFF,) CASE NO. 07CR00329-LAB		
6	VS.)) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		
7) AUGUST 13, 2007 BRENT ROGER WILKES,) 9:30 A.M.		
9	DEFENDANT.)		
10	/		
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT		
12	ATTORNEY APPOINTMENT HEARING		
13			
14	APPEARANCES:		
15	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: KAREN P. HEWITT, U.S. ATTORNEY BY: JASON A. FORGE, ESQ.		
16	VALERIE CHU, ESQ. ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS 880 FRONT STREET		
17 18	SAN DIEGO, CA. 92101		
19	FOR DEFENDANT FOGGO: AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD		
20	(TELEPHONIC) BY: ANDREW DOBER, ESQ. PAUL BUTLER, ESQ.		
21	1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036-1564		
22			
23	FOR DEFENDANT WILKES: GERAGOS & GERAGOS, ESQ.		
24	350 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE, 39TH FL. LOS ANGELES, CA. 90071		
25			

			2
1	CONTINUED APPEARANCES:		
2	FOR DEFENDANT WILKES:		
3		BY: EUGENE IREDALE, ESQ. 105 WEST F STREET, STE.	
4		SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	
5			
6			
7	COURT REPORTER:	EVA OEMICK	
8	COOK! KEI OK! EK!	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE	
9		940 FRONT STREET, STE. 2190 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	
10		TEL: (619) 615-3103	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

BY THE DEFENSE THAT IS INVOLVED IN BOTH. AND I THINK THAT

MR. GERAGOS WANTED TO MAKE A PRESENTATION AND AN ARGUMENT TO

THE COURT IN THAT REGARD. AND I ALSO WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT

I AM, GIVEN THE NATURE OF THE CASE, PROPERLY GUIDED IN WHAT IS

APPROPRIATE AND NOT APPROPRIATE FOR ME TO DO IN RESPECT TO

BOTH CASES.

THE COURT: MR. GERAGOS, YOU HAVE A STATEMENT TO MAKE WITH RESPECT TO PROVIDING THE INFORMATION ON THE WILKES MICHAEL CASE.

MR. GERAGOS: YES, YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD. I WOULD JOIN MR. IREDALE'S REQUEST. JUST FROM OUR STANDPOINT OF THE WILKES MICHAEL CASE IS TO PUT IT OVER FOR A COUPLE OF DAYS TO CONTINUE OUR CONVERSATION.

AS THE COURT KNOWS, I BELIEVE THERE WAS GREAT

DEFENSE BETWEEN THE TWO CASES. I WOULD LIKE TO CONTINUE TO

TALK TO HIM ABOUT THAT. I GUESS THERE IS A CROSS-OVER IN THE

WILKES MICHAEL CASE, BECAUSE I THINK IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT

WHOEVER IS HANDLING THE WILKES FOGGO ALSO HAS SOME INVOLVEMENT

IN THE WILKES MICHAEL CASE. AND MR. IREDALE AND I HAD A

COUPLE OF CONVERSATIONS. I HAVE GOT A LOT OF TIME TODAY AND

TOMORROW HOPEFULLY TO CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION AND HAVE

MR. WILKES FOR REPRESENTATION.

THE COURT: GOOD.

MR. FORGE, LET ME REFRESH MY MEMORY. I DON'T THINK
THAT THERE WAS ANY TYPE OF PROTECTIVE ORDER OR ANY OTHER ORDER

		8	
1	000		
2			
3			
4	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE TESTIMONY		
5	ADDUCED IN THE FOREGOING MATTER IS		
6	A TRUE RECORD OF SAID PROCEEDINGS.		
7			
8	S/EVA OEMICK 9-25-07		
9	EVA OEMICK DATE OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER		
10	OFFICIAL COOK! KEPOKIEK		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			